



FOX • ROTHSCCHILD_{LLP}

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2000 MARKET STREET • TENTH FLOOR • PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3291
215.299.2000 • FAX 215.299.2150 • www.foxrothschild.com

Charles N. Quinn
Direct Dial: (215) 299-2135
Internet Address: cquinn@foxrothschild.com

August 24, 2004

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: Mail Stop Patent Amendment

Re: Applicant: Frank Cistone, et al.
Serial No.: 10/087, 212
Filed: February 28, 2002
Title: Melt Processable
Perfluoropolymer Forms

Dear Sirs:

Enclosed herewith for filing, please find a paper styled "Revised Amendment and Response to Restriction Requirement Submitted in Response to Compliance Notice Dated 9 August 2004" together with a return post card which we would ask you to stamp and return to us as evidence of receipt of this paper.

To the extent there are any fees required in connection with a receipt or processing of this paper, please charge all such fees to deposit account 50-1943. A duplicate copy of this letter is enclosed to facilitate such charging.

We respectfully solicit notification of the acceptability of the papers submitted herewith and a prompt and favorable reaction on the part of the patent examiner to the positions taken in this paper.

Respectfully,

Charles N. Quinn
Attorney for Applicant
Registration # 27,223

CNQ/mgk
Enclosure



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Frank Cistone et al.

Group Art Unit: 1771

Serial No.: 10/087,212

Examiner:
Lynda Salvatore

Filed: February 28, 2002

For: MELT PROCESSABLE
PERFLUOROPOLYMER FORMS

Charles N. Quinn
Reg. No. 27,223
Fox Rothschild LLP
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-299-2135
Fax: 215-299-2150
Email: cquinn@foxrothschild.com
Deposit Account: 50-1943

**REVISED AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO
RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE
TO COMPLIANCE NOTICE DATED 9 AUGUST 2004**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This is submitted in response to a Compliance Notice dated 9 August 2004 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office which addressed a response paper dated 23 July 2004 submitted for the above-reference United States Patent application.

This paper is a corrected version of applicant's paper dated 23 July 2004, which has been corrected to address the issue raised in the Compliance Notice.

Other than the changes to the paper to address the matters raised in the Compliance Notice, this paper is identical to applicant's 23 July 2004 paper.

The 23 July 2004 paper was submitted in response to an official action having a mailing date of 23 April 2004 in which the examining attorney stated that claims 1 through 30, 35 through 38 and 48 through 77 are pending in the application and that of those claims, claims 1 through 8, 11, 31 through 34, 22 through 28, 52 through 54, 59 through 64 and 65 through 77 were withdrawn from consideration.

The examiner further stated that claims 9, 10, 12 through 21, 29, 30, 48 through 51, 57 and 58 were rejected.

The examiner further repeated and adhered to a previous restriction requirement noting that applicant had previously elected, with traverse, the claims of Group II for immediate prosecution in the event the restriction requirement is not withdrawn. The examiner still further noted that the examiner had erred in making the restriction requirement with respect to the grouping of claims 9 and 10 and noted that claims 9 and 10 should have been grouped with the Group II claims. Accordingly, the examiner stated that claim 9 and 10 would be examined with the Group II claims 12 through 21, 29, 30, 48 through 51 and new claims 57 and 58. As a result, a new restriction requirement was set forth, with three groups of claims.

Under the new restriction requirement claim Group I consists of claims 1 through 8, 11, 31 through 34 and 59 through 64, purportedly drawn to textured

yarns, staple fibers or single and/or multi-component yarns allegedly fell within class 428, subclass 357 et seq.

Claim Group II, consisting of claims 9, 10, 12 through 21, 29, 30, 48 through 51, 57 and 58 all purportedly drawn to nonwoven fabric classified in class 442, subclass 327 et seq., constituted a second claim grouping.

The third claim grouping consisting of claims 22 through 28, 52 through 54 and 65 through 77 all purportedly drawn to filtration and coalescing media classified in class 210 and various subclasses therefrom.

Applicant again traverses the restriction requirement, again requests reconsideration of the restriction requirement and again submits that the examiner's restriction requirement and the reasoning therefor is improper and does not comport with the requirements of the statute and the relevant rules.